

**FINAL REPORT
OF THE
INTERIM STUDY COMMITTEE ON
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ISSUES**



**Indiana Legislative Services Agency
200 W. Washington Street, Suite 301
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204**

November, 2008

INDIANA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

2008

Senator David Long
Vice-Chairman
Fort Wayne

Speaker B. Patrick Bauer
Chairman
South Bend

Senator Richard Young
Milltown

Representative Brian Bosma
Indianapolis

Senator Brandt Hershman
Monticello

Representative Charlie Brown
Gary

Senator Connie Lawson
Danville

Representative Dale Grubb
Covington

Senator Teresa Lubbers
Indianapolis

Representative Scott Pelath
Michigan City

Senator James Merritt
Indianapolis

Representative Russell Stilwell
Boonville

Senator Vi Simpson
Bloomington

Representative William Friend
Macy

Senator Samuel Smith
East Chicago

Representative Kathy Richardson
Noblesville

John M. Ross
Executive Director
Legislative Services Agency

INTERIM STUDY COMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ISSUES

Membership Roster

Representatives

Trent Van Haaften, Vice-Chairperson
Mt. Vernon

Scott Pelath
Michigan City

Phil GiaQuinta
Fort Wayne

Matt Bell
Avilla

Jack Lutz
Anderson

Thomas Dermody
LaPorte

Senators

Ron Alting, Chairperson
Lafayette

Richard Bray
Martinsville

James Merritt
Indianapolis

Timothy Lanane
Anderson

Earline Rogers
Gary

Vi Simpson
Bloomington

Staff

Anne Haley
Attorney for the Committee

Eliza Houston
Attorney for the Committee

A copy of this report is available on the Internet. Reports, minutes, and notices are organized by committee. This report and other documents for this Committee can be accessed from the General Assembly Homepage at <http://www.in.gov/legislative/>.

I. STATUTORY DIRECTIVE

The Indiana General Assembly enacted P.L. 94-2008 (HEA 1118) directing the Committee to study the following topics:

- "(1) Alcohol server training and employee permits for sales clerks in dealer establishments.
- (2) Additional one, two, or three-way permits for restaurants in economic development areas.
- (3) Displaying alcoholic beverages in separate areas in dealer establishments.
- (4) The historic origins of Indiana alcoholic beverage laws and the Twenty-first Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and its place and purpose in the twenty-first century."

The Legislative Council also assigned the following additional topic to the Committee:

- (5) "Sunday sale of microbrewery products for carry-out at Indiana microbreweries." (HR 119)

II. SUMMARY OF WORK PROGRAM

The Committee met three times during the 2008 interim session on the following dates:

August 15, 2008.

August 20, 2008.

October 15, 2008.

The Committee is a two year study committee that is not required to file a final report until November 1, 2009.

III. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

For a more detailed account, minutes for the Committee can be accessed from the General Assembly Homepage at <http://www.in.gov/legislative/>.

The first reference to a witness includes name of the witness and the person or organization the witness represents. For brevity, any subsequent reference includes only the name of the witness. A witness list is included at the end of the report.

August 15, 2008 meeting

Additional one, two or three-way permits for restaurants in economic development areas

Current law

The number of retailer (restaurant) permits that may be issued to locations within a city or town is limited by a quota (IC 7.1-3-22-3 and IC 7.1-3-22-6) that is based upon the population of the municipality. IC 7.1-3-20-16 allows the Alcohol and Tobacco Commission (ATC) to issue additional restaurant permits to certain economic development areas that are not counted toward the municipality's quota.

Testimony

Permits and economic development and revitalization

Mr. Matt Brase, Indiana Association of Cities and Towns, and Ms. Tanya Galbraith, Town Manager of McCordsville, said that restaurant permits are necessary for developing and revitalizing retail areas. Dr. Thomas Van Horn, Planner/Project Manager for the City of Lafayette, appearing before the Committee and Mr. Matt Murphy, Economic Development Director of the City of Valparaiso, in a letter to the Committee, said that restaurant permits contributed to the success of revitalization areas in their cities. Mr. Tom Klein, Town Manager of Avon, said that Avon's growth has created a demand for additional restaurant permits. Mr. Mark Palmer, attorney, Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP, on behalf of Al Krygier, Schererville, said a distinction should be drawn between issuing additional permits to revitalize a distressed economic area and issuing additional permits to satisfy a demand caused by an area's rapid economic growth. Ms. Lisa Hutcheson, Indiana Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking, said that a community's characteristics must be considered before issuing additional permits; statistics show that there are more alcohol sales in low income areas, accompanied by increased crime, violence, and impaired driving.

Existing restaurant permit prices

Mr. Bob Super, Precision Development, said if there are no permits available, new businesses pay high prices for existing permits. Mr. Mark Palmer said that permit holders rely on the sale proceeds of their permit to fund their retirement and that banks often issue permit holders credit lines based upon the permit's value. Mr. Palmer said that issuing additional permits devalues existing permits; previous legislation allowed new permits to be issued for as little as \$1,000. In a letter to the Committee, Rep. Craig Fry expressed his concern that granting discounted restaurant three-way permits for economic development areas would reduce the value of existing restaurant permits, and proposed excluding Mishawaka at least temporarily from any proposed legislation on this issue.

Quota as the basis for permit distribution

Mr. Don Marquardt, Indiana Licensed Beverage Association, said that he supports the current quota system. Mr. Tom Klein said that the current quota system, which relies upon decennial census figures, does not accurately reflect the current population in a metropolitan statistical area and that the quota disregards the population of the adjacent incorporated areas that use a municipality's services. Mr. Bob Super said the use of residential population figures doesn't recognize that people travel long distances between their home and their place of business and that highway traffic counts afford a more accurate measure of the activity surrounding a municipality.

Changing the quota/ permit distribution process

Witnesses offered the following suggestions for changing the permit distribution process:

- Mr. Bob Super said that other states give municipalities the authority to develop standards for issuing permits and restricting the number of permits.
- Mr. Matt Brase suggested: (1) issuing municipalities additional permits in anticipation of the next census; (2) creating a statewide formula for issuing additional permits; (3) involving local redevelopment commissions in defining "economic development area" for purposes of permit distribution; and (4) looking at Michigan's law (MCL 436.1521a) which distributes permits based upon population and the amount of investment.
- Mr. John Livengood, Restaurant and Hospitality Association of Indiana, suggested creating a county-wide quota that would account for a municipality's suburban population. He also suggested creating a tavern permit that is separate from a restaurant permit.
- Mr. Don Marquardt, said that existing permit holders bought riverfront development permits and then sold their existing permits for a profit. Mr. Matt Brase, suggested restricting economic development permits from being sold or transferred. Mr. Mark Palmer, said that his clients are concerned about the statutory mandate that some economic development permits are attached to the permit premises.
- Mr. John Livengood suggested allowing cities or economic development areas to purchase additional alcohol permits at fair market value. Mr. Livengood said that new permits should be sold at auction and available to everyone, not just developers. Mr. Don Marquardt, suggested allowing a developer to buy a permit at fair market value and receive a local or state tax break or incentive to compensate for the cost of the permit.

Considerations in determining the value of restaurant permits

(Note: The following testimony was received by the Committee at the meeting on October 15, 2008. Since the testimony pertains to restaurant permits in economic development areas, the testimony is being presented here.)

Mr. Jeffrey McKean, McKean Law Firm, and Mr. Gregory T. Genrich made the following points regarding factors affecting the value of restaurant permits:

- Increased population and the clustering of businesses increases the demand for permits.
- A permit's price is affected by the timing of the purchase (a buyer with a three year window for obtaining a permit will get a lower price than a buyer who needs one right away). Permit prices are location specific.
- A restaurant permit sold with a business is difficult to value because the value is tied in with the goodwill of the business.
- The law does not allow permits to be bought and held for speculative purposes.

The LSA attorney distributed to the members information compiled by the National Conference of State Legislators regarding the quota systems of other states. LSA also distributed information regarding efforts of the following states in dealing with the issue of permits outside the quota:

(1) South Dakota adopted legislation (SB 126, 2008) to allow municipalities and counties to issue an unlimited number of new liquor permits. Before purchasing one of these new permits, a buyer has to first consult a county-created registry to see if there is an existing license for sale. If there are no existing licenses for sale on the registry, or the buyer is unable to purchase a license on the registry for the current market price and on satisfactory terms to the buyer and seller, then the county can sell the buyer a new license for the current fair market price (current fair market price is defined as the documented price of a license most recently sold between January 1, 2003 and January 1, 2008, through an arms length transaction, less the value of any real or personal property included in the transaction).

(2) Idaho's governor has established a task force to study the quota and license distribution. Legislation is planned for the 2009 session based on the findings of the task force.

(3) California recently adopted legislation (Assembly Bill No. 2266, 2008) to authorize five new additional permits outside the quota for the Napa Valley.

Sunday sale of microbrewery products for carryout at Indiana microbreweries

Current law

Indiana farm wineries are allowed to make Sunday carryout sales (IC 7.1-3-12-5). Indiana microbreweries are not allowed to make Sunday carryout sales.

Testimony

Sunday carryout

Mr. Mark Webb, lobbyist and attorney for the Brewers of Indiana Guild, and Mr. John Hill, Broadripple Brewpub, and Brewers of Indiana Guild, said that microbreweries only want to sell their own beer out of their own breweries on Sunday for at home consumption, the same right that farm wineries have.

Microbreweries are businesses

Mr. Mark Webb said that 25 of Indiana's 26 microbreweries have restaurants and employ 1,000 people. Mr. Greg Emig, Lafayette Brewing Company, and Brewers of Indiana Guild discussed his brewery's contribution to revitalizing downtown Lafayette and the other ways it has given back to the community. Representative Matt Bell, Committee Member, suggested that the legislature may want to consider supporting microbreweries in the manner that wineries receive state support through the wine grape market development fund.

Sunday carryout aids tourism

Mr. Mark Webb said that Indiana's microbreweries are nationally and internationally known, are award winning, and are tourism sites. Mr. Penn Jensen, Upland Brewing Company, and Brewers of Indiana Guild and Mr. Ted Miller, Brugge Brasserie, and Brewers of Indiana Guild, said that not having Sunday carryout sales negatively affects their ability to promote weekend tours, because tourists are not allowed to buy the products they taste on the tour.

Amount of carryout

Mr. Mark Webb said that current law limits the amount of beer microbreweries can sell for carryout to not more than a keg, but most customers purchase six packs or half gallon "growlers" after touring the brewery. Mr. Jeff Eaton, Barley Island Brewing Company, and Brewers of Indiana Guild said he has been contacted on Sunday by people wanting to purchase a keg.

Sunday sales: grocery stores, package liquor stores

Mr. Joe Lackey, Indiana Grocery and Convenience Store Association, said that his association does not object to Sunday sales by microbreweries. Mr. John Livengood, said that package liquor stores do not want Sunday sales and are concerned Sunday sales will eventually be granted to package liquor stores. Mr. Grant Monahan, Indiana Retail Council, Inc., discussed the creation of a group launching an effort to petition the General Assembly for cold beer sales and Sunday sales of alcohol in drug, grocery, and convenience stores.

Illegal consumption/DUI

Ms. Elizabeth Spiller, representing the victim of a drunk driver, said the Committee should consider how people are affected by these issues in addition to business profits. Mr. Joe Lackey said that since restaurants are allowed to sell alcohol on Sunday for consumption on the premises, the state seems to find it acceptable to drink and drive but not acceptable to purchase alcoholic beverages to consume at home. Mr. John Hill said he has never had an underage drinking violation in the 18 years he has had his business.

August 20, 2008 meeting

Alcohol server training and employee permits for sales clerks in dealer establishments.

Current law

Package liquor store managers and clerks are required to obtain alcohol server training (see IC 7.1-3-1.5-1 and IC 7.1-3-1.5-2) and are required to have an employee permit (IC 7.1-3-18-9). Package liquor store clerks must be 21 years of age. In contrast, grocery store or drug store sales clerks are not required to have alcohol server training or an employee permit. Grocery store and drug store clerks may ring up alcohol sales if they are at least 19 years of age.

Testimony

In-house training

Mr. John Livengood, Association of Beverage Retailers, said that his association prefers in-house alcohol server training by programs such as ServSafe, instead of the ATC's training program. Mr. Livengood said that ServSafe is a national program that can be tailored for Indiana and that relies upon scientific data. Mr. Livengood suggested specifying in statute the programs that businesses may use for training their employees, in addition to allowing the ATC to approve programs. Mr. Joe Lackey said that the extensive in-house training that his clients' employees receive is sufficient. Ms. Tammy Loew, Indiana Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking, said that training is necessary because research shows that it reduces youth access to alcohol and impaired driving. Sen. Alting said that the ATC indicated that it would implement alcohol server

training by January 2009.

Minors/false IDs

Mr. Grant Monahan said that use of false IDs by minors to purchase alcohol is the biggest problem facing retailers. Mr. Joe Lackey said that all sales clerks should check a buyer's identification and suggested making drivers' license bar codes readable by cash register scanners. Mr. Lackey said that his clients' policy is to terminate an employee who sells alcohol to a minor.

With regard to other states, Mr. John Livengood said that Alaska allows a retailer to sue a minor who enters the licensed premises or shows fraudulent identification. In Texas, if a clerk who receives server training sells alcohol to a minor, the burden shifts from the owner to the clerk. Mr. Livengood suggests amending the law to allow sellers to confiscate fraudulent IDs.

Employee permits

Mr. Grant Monahan and Mr. Joe Lackey said that employee permits should be eliminated. Mr. Monahan said that obtaining an employee permit only requires completing a form and paying a fee. Mr. Lackey said that employee permits were created to generate money for excise officers' retirement funds.

Displaying alcoholic beverages in separate areas in dealer establishments

Separate display not needed

Mr. Grant Monahan said that this issue is an attempt by package liquor stores to restrict their competitors and require them to spend millions of dollars in remodeling costs. Mr. Monahan said that how a retailer lays out the store to please his customers is a free market issue. Mr. Monahan said that the issue is not access to alcohol but illegal sales, and retailers are already employing security measures such as video surveillance, security bottle caps, exit alarms, requiring a clerk to obtain the product, cash register prompts requiring an ID check, requiring ID checks of purchasers of who appear to be under 27 years of age, and terminating any employee who sells alcohol to a minor. Mr. Monahan and Mr. Joe Lackey said that if a customer is concerned with a store's alcohol display they should complain to the store manager, because retailers want to please their customers.

Mr. Monahan said that the legislature should look at minors' access to alcohol at sporting events, parties, and home, because 40% of teens say that they access alcohol through their parents and other adults. Mr. Lackey said that It does not make sense that it is acceptable for minors to see adults drinking but not acceptable to see alcoholic beverages on the shelf at a store. Mr. Monahan and Mr. Lackey support allowing children to accompany parents in package liquor stores, since the problem is illegal sales to minors, not access.

Separate display necessary

Ms. Tammy Loew, said that alcohol should be separated from other products in a store to reduce youth access to alcohol. Dr. Sigurd Zielke, adolescent clinical specialist at Fairbanks Hospital, said in written testimony submitted to the Committee that simply seeing alcohol sets off brain-based cravings for alcohol, and that youths who binge drink hard liquor report that they acquired it by stealing it. Mr. Jim Killen, speaking on his own behalf, said that the issue of separate display is a health issue and urged state public health officials to testify for the Committee.

Information from other states

The LSA attorney distributed copies of the following statutes and ordinances from other states that require alcohol in a grocery store to be displayed separately from other products:

New Mexico Statutes Annotated §60-6B-19 Title 15, Chapter 10, Part 2 and Title 15, Chapter 10, Part 52 of the New Mexico Administrative Code.

North Dakota Century Code, Title 5, Chapter 5-02.

Wyoming statutes §12-1-1-01; §12-5-201; §12-5-203.

Lincoln County, Nevada Ordinance

City of Dekalb, Illinois Ordinance

October 15, 2008 meeting

The historic origins of Indiana alcoholic beverage laws and the Twenty-first Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and its place and purpose in the twenty-first century.

Indiana's three tier system and direct wine shipping

(A) Indiana's three tier system.

The role of the wholesaler in the three tier system

Mr. Marc Carmichael, Indiana Beverage Alliance, explained that before Prohibition, suppliers coerced retailers into selling their products and some suppliers also acted as retailers. After Prohibition, the wholesaler tier was created to separate the supplier and the retailer and regulate sales by ensuring retailers are licensed, preventing coercion of retailers, and collecting excise taxes. Mr. David Heath, Chairman, Alcohol and Tobacco Commission, said that wholesalers are a necessary mechanism and the lowest cost means of regulation. Mr. Heath said

that the three tier system creates economic separation between the tiers, ensures an orderly market in the sale and distribution of alcohol, aids in the collection of excise taxes, and promotes moderate and legal alcohol consumption. Mr. Jim Purucker, Wine and Spirit Wholesalers of Indiana, said that all states have some form of the three tier system, some (like Indiana) use a licensed wholesaler for the middle tier, while in "control states" the state is the wholesaler. Mr. Phil Terry, Monarch Beverage Company, said that the three tier system is relevant today because it is transparent and accountable, making it easy for manufacturers to quickly locate defective products through their wholesalers and in turn through their retailers. Mr. John Livengood said that package liquor stores were also created a result of the regulatory scheme after Prohibition to perform face to face sales of alcohol.

Continued need for wholesaler tier

Mr. Marc Carmichael said that polls of registered voters commissioned by the Indiana Beverage Alliance show that Indiana has a conservative view toward alcohol policy, indicating that a majority believe the primary role of the state is to ensure responsible consumption and that selling alcohol directly to the consumer over the Internet would increase underage drinking. Mr. John Livengood, Indiana Association of Beverage Retailers, said that the three tier system provides good service and price to retailers, adding that most large retailers do not want to distribute alcohol on their own, but if they do, prices for the smaller retailers will go up. Mr. Livengood said that wholesalers are good corporate citizens that contribute to their communities.

(B) Direct wine sales and shipping.

Growth of Indiana farm wineries

Ms. Lisa Hays Murray, Hays, Murray, Castor, LLC, said that In 2007, Indiana wineries produced 800,000 gallons of wine to make Indiana the tenth largest wine producer in the U.S. In 2008, Indiana has over 400 acres of vineyards. Indiana's 37 wineries collected \$400,000 in excise tax and \$2.8 million in sales tax in 2007. Indiana wineries have won national and international awards and are a popular tourist destination.

Direct wine shipping litigation history

Mr. Fred Biesecker, attorney, Ice Miller, made the following points:

- *Granholm v. Heald*, involved Michigan and New York statutes favoring in-state wineries. In *Granholm*, the U.S. Supreme Court found the three tier system to be legitimate and that a state may not grant preferences to local wineries.
- In *Baude v. Heath*, the U.S. District Court struck down as unconstitutional two provisions in the Indiana direct shipping law. One provision prohibited the holder of a direct wine seller permit from holding a wholesaler permit. The second provision required a

consumer to provide the seller with identification and proof of age in an initial face-to-face transaction, before the consumer can have wine shipped directly by the seller.

- *Baude v. Heath* was appealed and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit agreed that the wholesaler provision is unconstitutional, but reversed the District Court as to the face-to-face provision. The court has indicated that the further away from the three tier system the law travels, the less likely the court will defer to the legislature's judgment.
- December 9, 2008 is the deadline for plaintiffs to file an appeal in *Baude* with the U.S. Supreme Court. There are two cases in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit that involve the face-to-face requirement. If the decisions in these cases conflict with the 7th Circuit's decision in *Baude*, this may be one reason why the U.S. Supreme Court would decide to hear *Baude*.

Negative effect of direct shipping restrictions on farm wineries

Ms. Lisa Hays Murray said that from 1971 until 2005, wineries could sell and ship directly to retailers and consumers in addition to selling wine in their tasting rooms. In 2005 (following *Granholtz*), the ATC prohibited wineries from making direct shipments to Indiana consumers. In 2006, the legislature prohibited wineries from selling directly to retailers and restricted wineries to shipping only 3,000 cases to all Indiana customers, thereby reducing Indiana wineries' shipping totals by at least 2/3. Mr. Larry Satek, Satek Winery, said that Indiana wineries' production decreased from 800,000 gallons in 2007 to 740,000 in 2008, affecting 20 to 30 jobs.

Ms. Murray said that Indiana wineries' 2009 legislative proposal is to: (1) provide third party verification as an alternative to the face-to-face requirement; (2) increase the direct seller shipping limit to 10,000 cases; (3) allow a farm winery permit holder to hold a 50% ownership interest in a micro-wholesaler permit; and (4) give wineries back their wholesaler privileges by allowing them to sell not more than 2,000 gallons (833 cases) to retailers.

The face-to-face requirement

Current law

IC 7.1-3-26-6 provides that a seller may only sell and ship wine directly to a consumer *if the consumer has provided in an initial face to face transaction at the seller's place of business*, the consumer's personal information (name, address, telephone), proof of age, and a verified statement that the consumer meets the statutory requirements.

Electronic age verification as an alternative to the face to face requirement

Mr. John Keeler, Baker and Daniels, representing the Wine Institute, said that the face to face requirement burdens wineries, because it requires consumers to travel to a winery before they can have wine shipped to them. Ms. Lisa Hays Murray said that only Indiana, Kansas, and Arizona have a face-to-face requirement (Kentucky's was invalidated on appeal) while Michigan, Ohio, and Georgia require electronic age verification. Ms. Murray said that Michigan, in adopting the electronic age verification requirement, said that the wineries should not bear the liability for collecting and maintaining consumer's identification documents. Mr. Allen Dale Olson, VinSense, Inc., said that his consumer advocacy group's goal is to eliminate the face-to-face requirement, enabling Indiana consumers to purchase wine electronically from producers and retailers. Ms. Murray said that Indiana retailers, dealers, and microbreweries can deliver directly to a consumer and there are no statutory safeguards in place to prevent minors from obtaining access to alcohol.

Direct wine shipping and minors

Mr. John Keeler said that minors usually get alcohol from parents and friends and by using false IDs, and that it is unlikely that they would order a case of expensive wine and wait a week for it to arrive. Mr. Mark Easley, Easley Winery, suggested making alcohol education part of the educational process. Ms. Lisa Hays Murray said there have been no access to minor violations for Indiana farm wineries for the last five years and that states that have direct shipment have few, if any, problems. Ms. Murray said that the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Rowe v. New Hampshire Motor Transport*, which held that federal law preempts state regulation of common carriers, would probably prevent the state from legislating commercial drivers license penalties for common carrier drivers who deliver alcohol to minors.

Direct wine shipping and collection of excise taxes

Mr. John Keeler said that there is no indication that out of state wineries would fail to pay state excise taxes any more than in-state wineries.

Accessing small batch wines through direct shipping

Mr. John Keeler said that the three tier system works well for the sale of mass produced commodities like Gallo or Budweiser, but wine produced in limited quantities is difficult for the system to handle, explaining that there are over 40,000 wine labels produced today. Mr. Richard P. Hofstetter, VinSense Inc., said that his group wants to open up the market to 95% of the wineries that Indiana consumers can't purchase products from because the wineries are too small to be carried by a wholesaler. Mr. Kenneth Harker, Jr., VinSense Inc., explained that his group's proposal adds enough economic cost into the purchase of a direct shipped product that it is unlikely that it will supplant the mass marketing of the wholesaler. Mr. Harker said that some wineries produce a label in such small quantities that it is not cost

effective for them to mass market it. Mr. Phil Terry said that some small batch wines produced by out of state wineries are not available to wholesalers because the supply is self-distributed by the winery or shipped directly to the consumer.

IV. COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee had no findings and recommendations.

WITNESS LIST

Mr. Fred Biesecker, Ice Miller

Mr. Matt Brase, Indiana Association of Cities and Towns

Mr. Marc Carmichael, Indiana Beverage Alliance

Mr. Mark Easley, Easley Winery

Mr. Jeff Eaton, Barley Island Brewing Company, and Brewers of Indiana Guild

Mr. Greg Emig, Lafayette Brewing Company, and Brewers of Indiana Guild

Rep. Craig Fry

Ms. Tanya Galbraith, Town Manager of McCordsville

Mr. Gregory T. Genrich

Mr. Kenneth Harker, Jr., VinSense Inc.

Mr. David Heath, Chairman, Alcohol and Tobacco Commission

Mr. John Hill, Broadripple Brewpub, and Brewers of Indiana Guild

Mr. Richard P. Hofstetter, VinSense Inc.

Ms. Lisa Hutcheson, Indiana Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking

Mr. Penn Jensen, Upland Brewing Company, and Brewers of Indiana Guild

Mr. John Keeler, representing the Wine Institute

Mr. Jim Killen

Mr. Tom Klein, Town Manager of Avon

Mr. Joe Lackey, Indiana Grocery and Convenience Store Association

Mr. John Livengood, Restaurant and Hospitality Association of Indiana, and Association of Beverage Retailers

Ms. Tammy Loew, Indiana Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking

Mr. Don Marquardt, Indiana Licensed Beverage Association

Mr. Jeffrey McKean, McKean Law Firm

Mr. Ted Miller, Brugge Brasserie, and Brewers of Indiana Guild

Mr. Grant Monahan, Indiana Retail Council, Inc.

Mr. Matt Murphy, Economic Development Director of the City of Valparaiso

Ms. Lisa Hays Murray, Hays, Murray, Castor, LLC

Mr. Allen Dale Olson, VinSense, Inc.

Mr. Mark Palmer, Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP, representing Al Krygier, Schererville

Mr. Jim Purucker, Wine and Spirit Wholesalers of Indiana

Mr. Larry Satek, Satek Winery

Ms. Elizabeth Spiller

Mr. Bob Super, Precision Development

Mr. Phil Terry, Monarch Beverage Company

Dr. Thomas Van Horn, Planner/Project Manager for the City of Lafayette

Mr. Mark Webb, representing Brewers of Indiana Guild

Dr. Sigurd Zielke, Fairbanks Hospital